

*BEST COPY*  
*AVAILABLE*

desirable, undesired, or inequitable result will flow from our desire to remove obstacles in the way of younger officers in these services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of these remarks the statement of President Eisenhower calling attention to the undesirable provisions of Public Law 86-155 relating to forced retirement of certain officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 11, 1959.

I have today signed H.R. 4413, "An act to provide improved opportunity for promotion for certain officers in the naval service, and for other purposes."

One provision of the Act repeals, effective November 1, 1959, a 1925 law which, as amended, requires upon their retirement, the honorary advancement to the next higher grade of Navy and Marine Corps officers who were specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat prior to January 1, 1947.

The November 1 deadline poses a serious problem for those active duty officers who are presently eligible for honorary promotion upon retirement. A number of these officers are, of course, on sea duty or at stations abroad. In a very short time they must decide either to effect their retirement by the November 1, 1959, deadline, or to continue on active service beyond that date in the hope that they will receive a regular promotion in due course.

This decision is made more difficult by the practical problems of H.R. 4413 which will bring about the forced retirement of many officers in order to prevent a stagnation in the promotion of their juniors. I believe that it would be only fair to officers, who by their noteworthy combat service, have shown their dedication to our country, that they be allowed an additional period of time during which to make what is for them a momentous decision.

Out of consideration for the service which these officers have rendered, I hope the Congress will promptly accord them such additional time.

SPORTS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear the present distinguished occupant of the chair (Mr. NEUBERGER) refer to the situation with regard to organized baseball, which is a subject in which I have been interested for a long time.

Mr. President, the bill introduced yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. KEFAUVER), for himself, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DIRKSEN), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HENRICKS), represents an admirable attempt to deal with the problem of the relation of the antitrust laws and our professional team sports. I am delighted the chairman of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee has accepted the principles embodied in S. 616, of which I am a cosponsor. Unfortunately, S. 2545 does not do the whole job, and it therefore is a misnomer to term it a true or complete sports bill.

The measure, as introduced, grants certain needed exemptions from the

antimonopoly statutes to the professional team sports of football, basketball, and hockey. I am heartily in favor of this move.

However, the sport of baseball is conspicuously absent from the language of this bill. This is its fatal flaw, and I intend to do all in my power to see that baseball is included in any measure which passes the Senate.

The need for congressional action in this field has been brought on by various Supreme Court decisions over the years which have indicated that baseball is exempt from the antitrust laws while football and the other sports are not. This clearly anomalous situation cries out for clarification by Congress. Indeed, the High Court has specifically invited action by Congress in this regard.

In order to lay the groundwork for correcting the inequity of the Supreme Court's edicts, committees of both Houses have held hearings all and on for several years. As a Member of both the House and Senate I have participated in these deliberations, and have heard literally thousands of words and scores of witnesses representing all facets of the operations of our professional team sports.

I have concluded from these hearings and from my own studies that each of the four major professional team sports deserves equal treatment under our laws. Each should be dealt with by legislation so that its status will be clear and equal.

While it is true that the operations of professional baseball differ in many respects from the manner in which the other sports run their businesses, I do not believe this should deter us from dealing with all of them in one legislative package. I believe a good deal has proved it is worthy of special treatment with these other sports. I am convinced its future performance will be marked by good faith and good cooperation in the best interests of the players, owners and fans of our national pastime.

I recognize of course that baseball is presently exempt under Supreme Court decisions from antitrust laws, and that this could serve as a reason for not dealing with it by legislation. But I do not think we should do this in a halfway manner. If we are going to clarify the status of our professional team sports and the antitrust laws, then let us do the whole job and include baseball. Otherwise, we will be casting a kind of double standard on all the activities of our country.

I also believe the fact that baseball is included in S. 2545 will have a salutary effect on the antitrust laws which are underway with regard to the establishment of a third national league. It is my hope that Congress will not try to hold a legislative limbo contest with organized baseball as these negotiations proceed. It is my hope we will put ourselves in the position of being monitors of baseball.

There is nothing in the record or future promise of baseball to merit such a stand by Congress. Baseball has proved its worth, honesty and good faith over the years. It should be included with equal rights and equal exemptions in

any true sports bill considered by Congress.

With these factors in mind, I shall offer in the Judiciary Committee an amendment to include baseball under the coverage of S. 2545. With that addition, I believe the job of Congress in correcting present legal inequities can be done and done well. We will have fulfilled our task of bringing order out of the potential chaos brought on by the High Court's rulings.

Perhaps most important of all, we will have given a vote of confidence to baseball and to these other sports. Each of them deserves this support and encouragement.

In the long run, I believe that the inclusion of baseball in a reasonable bill enacted by Congress will serve to spur progress toward the creation of the third major league—a dream close to my heart. On the other hand, I have serious reservations about the effect of legislation which does not include baseball. Such a bill could well scare off investors in the third league, and would generally serve as an upsetting influence on progress toward that goal.

While we must not expect miracles overnight as a result of the meetings commencing today on the third major league, it is incumbent upon Congress not to take any action which will hold up progress. The bill introduced yesterday could serve as such a roadblock. I am hopeful my activities to amend it will be successful, so that the third major league can continue upon its road to realization and actual operation in the very near future.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY: CHAMPION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the role played by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in the proclamation of Captive Nations Week has unfortunately been overlooked by many people. The manner in which he conceived this idea and helped speed it through Congress should be a matter of public record.

The work of Dr. Dobriansky on the resolution is but one facet of his unceasing labors in behalf of all peoples trapped behind the Iron Curtain. His particular efforts have been devoted, of course, to the plight of the noble people of the Ukraine, since he serves as Chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This committee has served well to retain the proud traditions of Ukraine, while promoting dedication to America and calling the attention of the free world to the present subjugation of their friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

Dr. Dobriansky, in addition to his labors in behalf of his beloved Ukraine, has also been active in academic and political circles. He has appeared often before committees of Congress and has frequently spoken and written on sub-

Approved For Release 2004/05/13 : CIA-RDP91-00965R000300110051-0

jects of national and international importance.

So that his activities, record and words may have the wide public dissemination they deserve, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Dr. Dobriansky's biography and other material relating to his work.

There being no objection, the biography, testimony, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### BIOGRAPHY OF DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

1. Born November 9, 1916, in New York City and educated in New York City public schools.

2. Studied at New York University (Ph.D., M.A., B.S.) and Fordham University.

(a) Charles Hayden Memorial scholar for 4 years at New York University; major in economics, minor in philosophy and history.

(b) Graduated magna cum laude, New York University.

(c) Studied formal philosophy at Fordham University for 7 years and offered graduate scholarship.

(d) Member of honor society, Beta Gamma Sigma, fraternity Delta Sigma Pi.

(e) Hirschland political science fellow at New York University, 1943-44.

(f) Teaching fellow in economics, New York University, 1942-44.

(g) Conferred honorary LL.D., Munich, Germany, 1952.

3. Taught at New York University and Georgetown University, faculty, the National War College.

(a) Teaching fellow in economics, New York University, 1942-44.

(b) Instructor in European history, New York University, 1943-44.

(c) Instructor in economics, New York University, 1944-48.

(d) Assistant Professor in economics, Georgetown University, 1943-52.

(e) Associate professor in economics, Georgetown University, 1952; (1) Acting chairman of department 1953-54; (2) Graduate school, course on Soviet economics, 1955.

(f) Faculty of political affairs, the National War College, 1957-58.

4. Additional activities in research, politics, etc.:

(a) Research in banking, American Bankers' Association, 1942-43 (small loan problems and ghost-written articles on subject).

(b) Associate editor of the *Caribbean Quarterly*, 1945.

(c) President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (member, All-American Committee to Combat Communism), 1946-55. National Chairman, 1955.

(d) Consultant, Republic in National Committee, 1951-52; 1955.

(e) Assistant Secretary, Republican National Convention, 1952.

(f) Consultant, Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, American Council on Education, 1952.

(g) Member, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy.

(h) Adviser, Nationalities Division, Republican National Committee, 1950.

(i) Military Intelligence, G-2 (Reserve), 1948-53.

(j) Military Government, commissioned lieutenant colonel (Reserve), 1945.

(k) Executive board member, Institute of Ethnic Studies, Georgetown University, 1958.

5. Civic and general public participation: (a) Testimonies in Congress, Senate Judiciary Committee on Immigration (1948); Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Genocide (1950), Wherry resolution (1951); mutual security (1952); House Foreign Affairs on diplomatic representation in Ukraine and Byelorussia (1953); Select House Committee on Communist Aggression (1954); House Ways and Means Committee

on foreign economic policy (1953); Senate Foreign Relations Committee on U.N. Charter revision (1955); Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on forced labor in U.S.S.R. (1956).

(b) Lectures and addresses on communism, Soviet economics, foreign policy and Eastern Europe before Air Force units, intelligence units (Fort Meade), military government units (Fort Meade), Exchange Club (Washington), Ingham's Society (Washington), Eagles convention (Philadelphia), Institute of Slavic Studies (Marquette University, Wis.), Cooperative League of Washington, Western College for Women (Ohio), Greater Buffalo Advertising Club, University of Michigan, Yale University, Johns Hopkins University, the National War College, College of City of New York, etc.

6. Appearances on radio and TV:

(a) Participant in economic discussions on economic, monetary and fiscal problems over WNYC in New York City, 1944-46.

(b) Commentaries on the U.S.S.R. with Gunnar Back, Washington and WMCA in New York City 1945-52.

(c) Network program of "Crossfire," 1952.

(d) Georgetown University TV Forum, 1952 to present.

(e) Radio and TV studios in Pittsburgh (WKD), Milwaukee, New Haven (WNHC-TV, 1956), Newark, N.J. (WATV 1955), Philadelphia, Pa. (WFL 1954), etc.

(f) Moderator of "Congress Looks at the Slave World," August 1954, U.S. Senate.

7. Authored over 200 articles, book reviews and pamphlets on economic and political subjects, appearing in *Human Events*, *Congressional Record*, *Epoch*, *Quarterly*, *Georgetown University in the Journal*, *Vital Speeches*, *Exchange*, *Ukrainian Bulletin*, *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, *Social Order*, *Manuscripts*, *Free World Review*, etc.

(a) Work on the Sober Philocephal System of Thorstein Veblen, An Episode in Modern Thought, N.Y.U., 1953.

(b) The Free Trade Ideal, Dow Chemical Co., 1954.

(c) Contribution to Russia-U.S. American Activities Committee Symposium on the Soviet Union, April 1956.

(d) *Veblenism: A New Critique*, 1957.

8. Membership in the following professional and other societies: American Economics Association, American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, American Association of University Professors, Academy of Political Sciences, National Academy of Economic and Political Sciences, Catholic Economics Association, American Finance Association, Council of 1955, American Institute of Management, 1956, Shcherchenko Scientific Society, National Society for Study of Education, University Club, Washington, National War College, etc.

9. Listed in "Who's Who in the South and West," "Who's Who in American Education," "Who Knows—and Who?" Directory of American Scholars, "American Men of Science III-1956," "Who's Who in Commerce and Industry," "Leaders in American Science (1958-59)," etc.

10. Travel Germany, 1946-47; Western Europe 1952-53; Middle East, 1950.

#### "THE USIA AND THE U.S.S.R."

(Testimony on the U.S. Information Agency by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, before Committee on Appropriations, the U.S. Senate, Friday June 12, 1959, Washington, D.C.)

Gentlemen, I appreciate deeply the privilege of this opportunity to testify on the U.S. Information Agency. We support the budgetary request made by the USIA to establish new transmitters for Voice of America broadcasts to the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. Needless to say,

many shortcomings and defects still continue to exist in the policy and operations of the USIA. Nevertheless, by reason of urgent circumstances, the requested funds should be appropriated with the specified intention of (1) redressing several blunderous changes recently effected in the Voice of America as concerns our broadcasts to these vital and strategic areas in the U.S.S.R.; and (2) expanding these broadcasts because of the internal satellite and captive status of these non-Russian nations.

We offer the following reasons to support this position:

(1) Strange as it may seem, last year some officials in the USIA and a related department concocted the bright idea of including the Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkmens, and the Azerbaijanis to listen to our broadcasts either in the language of their captor, namely Russian, or in English. It was suggested that we imitate in this respect the British Broadcasting Co. When strong opposition to this project of alienating these truly natural allies developed both in the Congress and among private groups, the argument for curtailing broadcasts in the languages of these different peoples was shifted to the ground of transmitter shortages and lack of appropriations. Hearings on this subject were held by the House Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations and my own testimony appears in its "Review of U.S. Information Agency Operations" (Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1959, pp. 102-161). Despite these hearings, on the basis of transmitter shortages the agency drastically reduced the Baltic and Ukrainian language broadcasts and eliminated entirely the Moslemic Uzbek program to central Asia. It appears now that the reestablishment and further improvement of these broadcasts are predicated on additional appropriations. In view of the established necessity of these appropriations, they should be made with the specification of the two aims cited above.

(2) The dimension of activity suggested by the concept of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. is still little appreciated or even recognized by our Government or people. Probably in no field of economics or political science is there more confusion and basic misconception than that relating to the U.S.S.R. The incontrovertible facts that (a) over half the population in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian, (b) almost half of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. is non-Russian, (c) the so-called Soviet economy is an empire economy thriving on rich captive resources, and (d) the history of every non-Russian nation in this substrate empire is, to present date, one of a struggle for national independence and freedom—these basic and determining facts continue to largely escape the understanding and imaginative thinking of our policy-makers. Indeed, nowhere in our Government is any systematic and continuous study being made of this non-Russian problem which gnaws the very core of Moscow's empire. We are told, for instance, to understand better the 100 million Russians but we virtually ignore the even greater and more real need for understanding the 110 million non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. whose aspirations and histories are by far more affluite to our own traditions and whose unreliability for Moscow has been repeatedly attested to by countless Russian overseers. To sustain and extend these aspirations in this peripheral area closest to the very heart of the empire logically would seem to be highest priority target of our psychological and other efforts. Instead, our broadcasts to these non-Russian nations are grossly inadequate in scope and depth for the achievement of this logical end—an end that is capable of giving us the most powerful political leverage against the aggressions of Moscow's cold war activity. For example, at present

there are no broadcasts to the 10 million Buddhists or the 30 million Moslems in the U.S.S.R. As a background to these observations, may I submit for the record this article on "Lands and Nations in the U.S.S.R."

(3) Our failure to capture the dominant spirit of these non-Russian nations accounts in the greatest measure for the extreme irony that in Asia and Africa today, Moscow, rather than we, is viewed as the main proponent of national independence, anticolonialism, and anti-imperialism. The one power that actually possesses a vastly extended empire, consisting of these internal satellites within the U.S.S.R. and also the external satellites in Europe and Asia, has by deception seized the center for which we, by tradition and spirituality, are best and honorably fitted. This situation is not only ironical but incredible and humiliating. Fortunately, some of our writers are beginning to grasp this. This article by G. L. Salzberger on Anticolonialism-Soviet Style (the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1959) which I would like to insert as part of this testimony, is a constructive example.

While in our simplicity we continue to fight the ghosts of international communism, Soviet communism, and Marxian ideology, behind these smokescreens the Muscovites capably apply the borderlands policy of the past tyrants of Muscovy to surpass the imperialist and colonial successes of previous czars. While people in this country, like the Overstretts who profess to tell us what we must know about communism, speak of a strange new force, the strangest and most enigmatic in all history, Russian scholars themselves, like Berdyaev and others who concretely experienced this force, long ago taught that Russian communism is the third form of Russian imperialism, the dominant preceding forms being the Third Rome ideology and Pan-Slavism. Actually, what is truly enigmatic is not Russia but our trained incapacity to comprehend its imperialism and colonialism within the legistic subterfuge known as the Soviet Union.

In short, our further reverses in the necessarily incessant cold war—and there are many in the offing—will not be the result of any missile gap, space lag, fictitious overall economic competition from Moscow, or domestic inflation, all of which are really of subsidiary significance in the cold war context. Instead they will be the direct result of a protracted misconception of the real nature of the enemy, his traditional modes of conspiracy and diplomatic and political duplicity, and his centuries-long Messianism. At the present time there is no separate and necessarily autonomous agency in our Government specializing in the study of these supposedly new techniques of cold war activity and, worse still, we have no apparatus to cope with them.

Our further reverses will also be the indirect result of our fantastic neglect of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Most of them are the first victims of Red Russian totalitarian imperialism and, significantly, it is historically on the basis of their subjugation that the extensions of Moscow's empire were and are made possible. The present state of U.S.S.R. operations regarding the basic area of the U.S.S.R. in the main reflect this neglect. With your permission to submit this background material into the record, I cannot stress too strongly your responsibility to bring about appropriate changes in this paramount respect. Our prudent and imaginative activity in this new dimension—the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.—stands to outvalue, and at far lesser cost, our missiles, our nuclear bombs,

and other hardware as concerns the insecurity of Muscovy in its traditional strides for world dominion. We are clearly unprepared to meet the challenges and requirements of conditions known as "neither peace nor war." And with the declining importance of physical military deterrence, our survival as an independent nation will rest upon our ability to meet these conditions.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, July 25, 1959]

**CREDIT BOON WITH CAPTIVE NATIONS IDEA—LAYS KHRUSHCHEV PEEVE TO INCLUSION OF U.S.S.R.**

WASHINGTON, July 24—A professor of Russian economics at Georgetown University here was disclosed Friday as the man who conceived the Captive Nations week idea that aroused the ire of Russian Nikita Khrushchev.

He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 41, who was born in New York City of parents of Ukrainian descent. Dobriansky first started work on the project more than a year ago.

The office of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, who guided the resolution in connection with the observance through Congress, confirmed the educator's role.

#### NAMES NATIONS IN U.S.S.R.

Dobriansky told the Chicago Tribune that the impact of the congressional resolution on Khrushchev apparently lies in the fact that it includes not only the names of recognized satellites of Russia, but also of countries that now are a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The resolution," said Dobriansky, "marks the first time that the United States has recognized by public law that captive nations exist within the U.S.S.R."

A check of the resolution bears Dobriansky out. Mingled in with Poland, Hungary, and other satellite nations are the following Soviet republics:

White Ruthenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Ukraine, Turkmenistan, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. What is Turkmenistan now once was the republic of Uzbekistan. Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, and Kirgizistan.

If Russia had not taken the above countries by force, claimed Dobriansky, it would be a third-rate power now. He said the fact that the resolution contains names of Soviet republics has received a big play in American foreign language papers read here by the Russian Embassy.

#### STIRRED BY NAGY FATE

Dobriansky said he got the idea for a congressional resolution recognizing the plight of captive nations at the time of the execution in mid-June of 1958 of Imre Nagy, Premier of Hungary at the time of its unsuccessful revolt against the Kremlin.

He said his first attempt last year consisted of a resolution introduced in the House by Representative Albert Cretella, Republican, Connecticut, which called for Presidential proclamations on independence or constitution days of 19 captive nations. The resolution died in the House judiciary committee on a tie vote. This year he lumped recognition into one Captive Nations Week.

#### IDEA'S WORDING DIFFERENT

Dobriansky pointed out that the congressional resolution refers to "Russian communism" and "Communist Russia" as the aggressor in the plight of the captive nations while President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, based on the resolution, refers to "Soviet dominated" countries.

He charged the State Department watered down the proclamation because it is "unimaginative" in failing to realize the power of "non-Russian nationalism, hostility and resistance" in the Soviet Union.

#### TRIBUTE TO U.S. NAVY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Charles W. Lee, of Rochester, N.Y., who was taken on an indoctrination cruise by the U.S. Navy during the recently held Operation Inland Sea.

Quite frequently the various branches of the armed services invite groups of civilians from particular areas to observe their maneuvers, operations, and demonstrations. This is done, as I understand, with the idea of showing those who might otherwise never have the chance to observe, what is actually going on in the services concerning new developments and techniques. Such tours demonstrate to these people the readiness and power of our country's armed might.

These private citizens quite generally return to their homes tremendously impressed by what they have seen, and in turn pass on the knowledge they have gained to their associates and other members of the community.

Mr. Lee had a very sad and unfortunate experience during the time when he was on the trip, when he received word of the unexpected death of both his mother and an uncle at the same time. Mr. Lee outlines in his letter to me the very considerate way in which the Navy got him back home in time for his mother's funeral.

To paraphrase what Mr. Lee says, he was greatly impressed with the importance attached by the U.S. Navy to a single individual's losses and troubles. It is a heartwarming letter to read.

We hear a great deal of criticism of our Armed Forces. I have been one who has voiced from time to time criticism of this, that, or the other service, when I felt that the service was guilty of some shortcoming. That is always going to be true, but it is very refreshing to read a letter of this sort. I think it is worth while to make the letter a part of the Record, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ROCHESTER, N.Y., August 6, 1959.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: After the Navy concluded Operation Inland Sea and the invasion, demonstration at Rochester, N.Y., I was most fortunate to receive an invitation as a civilian to sail on one of the ships from Rochester to Norfolk, Va. I left Rochester on July 27, on board the U.S.S. Oglethorpe (AKA-100) under the command of Capt. C. W. Flenniken, Jr.

On Saturday morning, August 1, when we were on the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Nova Scotia, I received a radio teletype message informing me of the unexpected deaths of both my mother and her brother. Captain Flenniken and his executive officer, Commander Rose, extended their deepest sympathy and respectfully advised that due to our position and the very dense fog through which we were traveling, there was no way to get off the ship by plane or other means. However, they tried constantly to make some arrangement by which I would be put ashore as soon as possible.

The destroyer U.S.S. Henley, which participated in Operation Inland Sea, was about

"American Policy and the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R." by Lev E. Dobriansky, Free World Forum, March 1959, pp. 21-22.